

REMARKS

In accordance with the forgoing, claims 2-4, 6, 8 and 10-14 are cancelled, without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter therein, and claims 1, 5, 7 and 9 are amended. Applicant respectfully requests entry and examination of new claims 15-20. No new matter has been added as a result of this amendment. The following remarks are respectfully submitted.

I. Rejections under 35 USC §103

Claims 1-5 and 7-12 stand rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Levine et al. (United States Patent #6,327,501) in view of Karp et al. (United States Patent #6,591,242) and further in view of DeLorme et al. (United States Patent #5,948,040). Applicant has cancelled claims 2-4, 8 and 10-12, without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter therein, rendering the rejection of these claims moot. Applicant traverses the rejection of claims 1, 5, 7 and 9 based on the following argument.

None of Levine et al., Karp et al., and DeLorme et al., either alone or in combination, teach or suggest every element and limitation of claims 1, 5, 7 and 9. For example, independent claim 1 defines a portable extender for use by a visiting nurse including, *inter alia*, a video camera. The Examiner has indicated that he interprets the use of an identification device taught by Karp et al. to encompass Applicant's use of a video cam, however Karp et al. do not teach or suggest the implementation of a video camera. In column 3 lines 15-22, and in column 4 lines 8-12, Karp et al. describe the identification device as being one to transmit a voice print, a finger print or a retina or iris print. Applicant asserts that the gather of none of these prints needs to employ a video camera. In fact, in the case of the finger, retina and iris prints, a still image, rather than a moving or video image, would be more appropriate. Thus, Applicant asserts that the Examiner has used hindsight to assert that teachings of Karp et al. encompass the use of a video camera.

In light of the argument presented above, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 1, 5, 7 and 9.

Claims 6 and 13 stand rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Levine et al, Karp et al., and DeLorme et al., as applied to claims 1 and 10 above, and further in view of Evans (United States Patent #5,924,074). Applicant has cancelled claims 6 and 13, without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter therein, rendering the rejection of these claims moot.

Claim 14 stands rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Levine et al, Karp et al., and DeLorme et al., as applied to claim 10 above, and further in view of Evans and Miller (United States Patent #5,235,702). Applicant has cancelled claim 14, without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter therein, rendering the rejection of this claim moot.

II. Conclusion

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned attorney to attend to these matters.

Respectfully submitted,

October 24, 2006
Date

/Michael C. Soldner/
Michael C. Soldner
Reg. No. 41,455
(763) 514-4842
Customer No. 27581